All things in Nature possess nothing, and make no claim.
—*Tao Te King*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 52 MAY, 1964 NUMBER 8

TEACHERS AND MOVEMENTS

IT is often said, and in the nature of things must be so, that the great teachers of history had no intention of starting or founding "religions," although, from their knowledge of human nature, they no doubt expected something of the sort to become involved in the results of their efforts. Buddha, for one, made it plain in his dialogue with Ananda, concerning the monk, Vacchagotta, that he would not serve the sectarian propensities of any group, preferring to keep silent.

Yet the shaping of organizations or social formations for the purpose of introducing changes in human attitudes and behavior seems an essential part of historical development. When the proposal for the formation of the Theosophical Society came in 1875, H.P.B. did not dissent. She needed a focus, a channel of communication, and "societies" were the only available institutions in the nineteenth century. But organizations, as such, were of only slight importance to H.P.B. Her cosmopolitan character and potent intelligence could never be contained by any institution and she made it plain that she would remain connected with the T.S. only so long as it remained an effective tool for the work she had to do.

An organization, after all, with its constitution and by-laws, and other institutional apparatus, is no more than an artificial device to compensate for the limitations of human beings at a given stage of evolution. In any human group, the wiser the individuals, the less

need there is of organization. The functions of elections, committees, and other aspects of organizational operation are replaced by intuitive consensus and division of labor by natural inclination. But where the coarse fibres of human nature are as yet unshaped, not immediately responsive to egoic insights, the adventitious aids of organization may prove indispensable. The problem is to prevent these aids from turning into permanent substitutes for the qualities whose development they are intended to serve.

Notice that H.P.B. *said* almost nothing about organizational development, beyond noting that the Theosophical Society had been modelled on the free society of the United States, suggesting or implying that this socio-political achievement of the New World was one reason for initiating the Theosophical Movement in the West. Her writings are exclusively devoted to individual human development. This was to be the foundation for the brotherhood which was her ideal from the beginning. The present state of the world, she said, "will last till man's spiritual intuitions are fully opened, which will not happen before we fairly cast off our thick coats of matter; until we begin acting from *within,* instead of following impulses from without. . . ." Quite obviously, she knew that the mechanisms of cooperative work would take care of themselves, if men would listen to their inner perceptions and make serious effort to find guidance in the principles of the Wisdom Religion.

A Theosophic association for human betterment has two chief functions. One is to provide a transmission belt to convey the Theosophical philosophy and teachings to the world at large. The other is to provide a school in which individuals may learn to understand themselves and the mysteries of the human heart in general, thus becoming more effective in their efforts in behalf of the wider brotherhood of man. Is there a conflict of interest here? Not really, although it may often seem so. Any educational undertaking which also attempts "practical work" has a problem of this sort. People are intended to learn, but there is also the work to get done, so that the tendency of the "work" to fall into the hands of those who seem most competent to carry it out is one that must be watched. If this organizational habit is allowed to prevail altogether, the educational purposes of the association will wane and finally disappear, leaving only an organization made up of status-bound leaders and followers. In the ideal educational association, there is a maximum interchangeability of role, so that the potentialities of everyone have

opportunity to emerge. But here, again, there can be no mechanical following of a rule. It contributes neither to brotherhood nor to education to use as a public speaker one who is unable to talk distinctly, or one who fails to give his thought a content that will interest and be understood by newcomers to Theosophy. Yet breadth in the sense of obligation comes only from bearing responsibility. An educational enterprise seeks delicate balance among various factors of growth and service to others. In the case of Theosophical education, the cause of brotherhood is the underlying dynamic which should guide decision and motivate personal development.

Conventional organization procedures are of little help here. These are matters of inner perception and integrity and cannot be regulated by external rules. To expect the formulas of organization to assure the educational process and the motives of service to others would be like relying on the penal code and the divorce laws to guarantee a fruitful and harmonious marriage. The magic of human understanding, the birth of sympathy and insight into the needs of others, the sustaining joy which comes from watching the intelligence of others unfold and blossom—these elements in the relationships of human beings are hardly susceptible of "control" by political procedures. An ever-present pitfall of organizational work is the somewhat mechanical judgment of others it imposes on all concerned. Intuitive relationships of confidence and trust are replaced by artificially created distinctions and forms of status. Rare human beings may remain untouched by these influences, but only a richly endowed individuality is immune to the weaknesses which have proved the fatal flaw in religious movements for thousands of years.

But what of "authority" and the protection of the individual against the fallibilities of human nature? It seems clear, from the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, that in this cycle of the Theosophical Movement the effort has been to establish a *philosophical* matrix of human development, as contrasted with the political and organizational forms of the past. The "checks and balances" in the philosophy at our disposal all relate to oneself, not to others. The tyranny to be guarded against, in this case, is of one's own psychic nature. And nowhere, be it noted, are we instructed to call a convention to decide what books to study and where lies truth.

In Theosophy there is no personal place to gain, no pride-satisfying status to achieve before the world. Were these objectives to be-

come prominent in Theosophical undertakings, the meaning of the philosophy would long since have been lost entirely. Just as the hope of the Movement lies in a deep faith in the spiritual nature of all human beings—in the conviction that, once the verities of the inner principles and processes of life are understood, men will find confirmation of these truths in themselves, and need no further stimulus than the mandate of their own hearts—so students come to place a similar confidence in one another, bearing one another's imperfections, trusting, instead, in those longings of the soul which alone can have brought each one into the stir and gathering motion of those who attempt to make Theosophy the animating vision of their lives.

A Teacher has no protection against the importunities and vices of man's lower nature. In becoming a teacher, he agrees to expose himself to the worst qualities of mankind, in the hope of arousing the best. This was the life-story of H.P.B.

"INFINITE SIDE OF MAN"

In our life we have one side which is finite, where we exhaust ourselves at every step, and we have another side, where our aspiration, enjoyment and sacrifice are infinite. This infinite side of man must have its revealments in some symbols which have the elements of immortality. There it naturally seeks perfection. Therefore it refuses all that is flimsy and feeble and incongruous. It builds for its dwelling a paradise, where only those materials are used that have transcended the earth's mortality. For men are the children of light. Whenever they fully realize themselves they feel their immortality. And, as they feel it, they extend their realm of the immortal into every region of human life.

—RABINDRANATH TAGORE

AVATARIC INFLUENCE

> The Presence of the Unseen Principle throughout all nature, and the highest manifestation of it on Earth—MAN, can alone help to solve the Problem, which is that of the mathematician whose *x* must ever elude the grasp of our terrestrial algebra. The Hindus have tried to solve it by their *avatars,* the Christians *think* they did it—by their one divine Incarnation. Exoterically—both are wrong; *esoterically* both of them are very near the truth.
>
> —*The Secret Doctrine*

THE doctrine of "divine incarnations" may seem remote, but the "Presence of the Unseen Principle throughout all nature" is very close to contemplate. It fills the heart and stills the mind.

One phase of the intrinsic mystery of the *Avatar* is that He or It cannot be thought of in isolation. Another inseparable phase is sacrifice—*yajna,* in Sanskrit. "The *Yajna,"* said the Brahmans, "exists from eternity, for it proceeded forth from the Supreme One . . . The *Yajna* exists as an invisible thing at all times; it is like the latent power of electricity in an electrifying machine, requiring only the operation of a suitable apparatus in order to be elicited. It is supposed to extend from the sacrificial fire to the heavens, forming a bridge or ladder by means of which the sacrificer can communicate with the world of gods and spirits, and even ascend when alive to their abode." (*Isis Unveiled,* xliii-iv.) The ladder of sacrifice serves both man's *ascent* and the Divine *incarnation*: "The descent of a god or some exalted Being into the body of a simple mortal."

The "Great Sacrifice" is made manifest in cycle upon cycle of the Rounds and Races throughout which the units of Mankind strive upward and search inward until awareness comes of their own divine nature and destiny. According to H.P.B.: "In each of the seven Root Races, and in every one of the seven regions into which Occult Doctrine divides our globe, there appears from the dawn of Humanity the 'Watcher' assigned to it in the eternity of the Æon. He comes first in his own 'form,' then each time as an Avatara."

When mortals shall have become sufficiently spiritualized, there will be no more need of *forcing* them into a correct comprehension of ancient Wisdom. Men will *know* then, that there never yet was a great World-reformer, whose name has passed into our generation, who (a) was not a direct emanation of the LOGOS (under whatever name known to us), *i.e.*, an *essential* incarnation of one of "the seven," of the "divine Spirit who is sevenfold"; and (b) who had not appeared before, during the past Cycles. They will recognize, then, the cause which produces in history and chronology certain riddles of the ages; the reason why, for instance, it is impossible *for them* to assign any reliable date to Zoroaster, who is found multiplied by twelve and fourteen in the *Dabistan;* why the Rishis and Manus are so mixed up in their numbers and individualities; why Krishna and Buddha speak of themselves as *re-incarnations, i.e.*, Krishna is identified with the Rishi Narayana, and Gautama gives a series of his previous births; and why the former, especially, being "the *very supreme* Brahma," is yet called *Amsamsavatara*—"a part of a part" only of the Supreme on Earth. Finally, why Osiris is a great God, and at the same time a "prince on Earth," who reappears in Thoth-Hermes, and why Jesus (in Hebrew, Joshua) of Nazareth is recognized, cabalistically, in Joshua, the Son of Nun, as well as in other personages. The esoteric doctrine explains it by saying that each of these (as many others) had first appeared on Earth as one of the seven powers of the LOGOS, individualized as a God or "Angel" (messenger); then, mixed with matter, they had re-appeared in turn as great sages and instructors who "taught the Fifth Race," after having instructed the two preceding races, had ruled during the Divine Dynasties, and had finally sacrificed themselves, to be reborn under various circumstances for the good of mankind, and for its salvation at certain critical periods; until in their last incarnations they had become truly only "the parts of a part" on Earth, though *de facto* the One Supreme in Nature. (*S.D.* II, 358-9.)

An illuminating distinction concerning the Avatar is made by Robert Crosbie. He says: "A *Siddhi-Purusha* (perfect man) is like an archeologist who removes the dust and lays open an old well which has been covered up by ages of disuse. The *Avatara,* on the other hand, is like an engineer who sinks a new well in a place where there was no water before. Great Men give salvation to those only who have the waters of piety hidden in themselves, but the *Avatara* saves him too whose heart is devoid of love and dry as a desert."

The unseen "Presence" is not spectacular. It touches the human heart, arousing to activity the dormant godlike powers within. What matters it for the moment that he knows not the source of this

beneficence? In a true sense it is the "heart" of man that is in evolution, and he will question: How do I *feel* about this? What is the nature of the *desire* that prompts my action? What unsuspected *motive* colors my choice? Self-questioning makes the brain "porous" to the influence of the Self within, as the lowly earthworm's burrowing through soil conditions the earth for especial usefulness.

The work of H. P. Blavatsky in this Cycle links the pre-historic Past with the predestined Future as has never been possible before. She came *not* to replace the wisdom of the Ancients, but to "make a plea for its recognition;" *not* to call attention to herself as a leader to be followed, but to sound myriad warnings against "following a leader"; *not* to promise reward for any action performed—though it be dissemination of theosophical ideas, but to point the way of service on the basis of Universal Brotherhood. In her second *Message* to the American Theosophists, she closes with these words:

> And now a last and parting word. My words may and will pass and be forgotten, but certain sentences from letters written by the Masters will never pass, because they are the embodiment of the highest practical Theosophy. I must translate them for you:—
>
> ". . . Let not the fruit of good Karma be your motive; for your Karma, good or bad, being one and the common property of all mankind, nothing good or bad can happen to you that is not shared by many others. Hence your motive, being selfish, can only generate a double effect, good and bad, and will either nullify your good action, or turn it to another man's profit." . . . "There is no happiness for one who is ever thinking of Self and forgetting all other Selves."
>
> "The Universe groans under the weight of such action (Karma), and none other than self-sacrificial Karma relieves it. How many of you have helped humanity to carry its smallest burden, that you should all regard yourselves as Theosophists. Oh, men of the West, who would play at being the Saviours of mankind before they even spare the life of a mosquito whose sting threatens them!, would you be partakers of Divine Wisdom or true Theosophists? Then do as the gods when incarnated do. Feel yourselves the vehicles of the whole humanity, mankind a part of yourselves, and act accordingly. . . ."
>
> These are golden words; may you assimilate them! This is the hope of one who signs herself most sincerely the devoted sister *and servant* of every true follower of the Masters of Theosophy.

In her fourth *Message,* written a few weeks before her Heart had uttered itself for this Incarnation, she wrote:

After all, every wish and thought I can utter are summed up in this one sentence, the never-dormant wish of my heart, "Be Theosophists, work for Theosophy!" Theosophy first, and Theosophy last; for its *practical* realization alone can save the Western world from that selfish and unbrotherly feeling that now divides race from race, one nation from the other; and from that hatred of class and social considerations that are the curse and disgrace of so-called Christian peoples. Theosophy alone can save it from sinking entirely into that mere luxurious materialism in which it will decay and putrefy as civilizations have done. In your hands, brothers, is placed in trust the welfare of the coming century; and great as is the trust, so great is also the responsibility. My own span of life may not be long, and if any of you have learned aught from my teachings, or have gained by my help a glimpse of the True Light, I ask you, in return, to strengthen the Cause by the triumph of which that True Light, made still brighter and more glorious through your individual and collective efforts, will lighten the World, and thus to let me see, before I part with this worn-out body, the stability of the Society secured.

May the blessings of the past and present great Teachers rest upon you. From myself accept collectively the assurance of my never-wavering fraternal feelings, and the sincere, heartfelt thanks for the work done by all the workers.

From their servant to the last,

H. P. Blavatsky

William Q. Judge wrote of H.P.B. (*Path,* 1891): "Her aim was to elevate the race. Her method was to deal with the mind of the century as she found it, by trying to lead it on step by step; to seek out and educate a few who, appreciating the majesty of the Secret Science and devoted to 'the great orphan Humanity,' could carry on her work with zeal and wisdom; to found a Society whose efforts—however small itself might be—would inject into the thought of the day, the ideas, the doctrines, the nomenclature of the Wisdom Religion, so that when the next century shall have seen its 75th year the new messenger coming again into the world would find the Society still at work, the ideas sown broadcast, the nomenclature ready to give expression and body to the immutable truth, and thus to make easy the task which for her since 1875 was so difficult and so encompassed with obstacles in the very paucity of the language,—obstacles harder than all else to work against."

letters • questions • comment

What is the difference, really, between a Christian theological prophecy of "eternal hell" for condemned souls and the Eastern religious teaching of soul annihilation? In the Judge-Crosbie Notes on The Bhagavad-Gita *(p. 191) he speaks of the possibility of annihilation and then says that the true disciple, of course, "does not by Ahankara destroy his own soul." What is meant by this?*

The reference to the passage in *Notes* to the "destruction of the soul" is intended to distinguish between Ahankara (egotism as the outlook of the lower self) and the center of Buddhi-Manasic perception which is the root of man's self-conscious being. This latter is that which is eternal, "for whom the hour will never strike," which "builds for endlessness." The destruction spoken of refers to the draining of the energies of creative mind by fixating them in the objects with which egotism is involved.

The "destruction of the soul" is often a figurative allusion. As H. P. Blavatsky has elsewhere indicated, when we have destroyed the soul-accumulations of a lifetime—or rather, the potential accumulations—this is truly an unfortunate kind of death. When we have failed to undertake those disciplines which unite our experiences and lead us forward to a greater depth and breadth of knowledge, we inevitably retrogress. Another way of putting this would be to say that the soul can lose its harvest, and in so doing loses a chapter, or several chapters, of its unfolding destiny.

The subject of "death of the soul" is often approached with a sense of horror which probably relates to the doctrines of hell-fire and damnation in Christian culture. But if we regard the soul philosophically, as the connective between experiences—Buddhi and Manas united—annihilation of the soul, like the awakening of the soul, will be seen as gradual and progressive rather than a single event. What is destroyed is the "substance" which supports *sutratma,* the link, so that the results of past experiences, as focussed in the presently existing personality, are destroyed.

In other words, to understand the idea of soul annihilation we need to understand the process of soul-awakening. Annihilation is simply the reverse of the assimilative process; if we reverse assimilation, we have as its opposite the accumulation of waste-products which destroy health—in the psyche, as emotional nature, and in mind as Kama-manas.

There are many forms of ignorance and each one is a form of annihilation—that is, a separation of the individual's center of perception from the opportunities of broadening his awareness. In terms of intra-personal relationships, this means the severing of those bonds of sympathy which enable us to participate in the lives and thoughts, successes and failures, of others. And in the theosophic sense it is true that no man is an island. If his egocentric motive causes him to lose sight of the sound and sense of others—who represent at the moment a different phase of his own development—he has also failed in his own harvest.

How many kinds of death are there? We must imagine them to be numerous indeed, if every "separation" is the death of a complex or a compound. There is a death for which all limited consciousness is destined and which, therefore, becomes a transition to a new life; but this is a death which is also a birth. Or, to put it differently, a true birth requires a letting go of that which holds in fixation the dynamic energies of the soul; a death which serves as more than severance. This positive death, which enables a man to unite the experiences of prior conditions of consciousness, means a transformation of the self—a metempsychosis, a further acquirement of individuality. A "negative" death is the death caused by the failure of the soul to incarnate in responsibilities, a refusal to assume the obligation of constant action—a failure to "raise the thief up to paradise," a failure of the personality to blend meaningfully with past and future lives.

Individuality, in the phrasing of the third Proposition of H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine,* is "acquired." The acquisition, of course, is not a possession but a persistence through progressive initiations. The death of the soul, in these terms, is simply the denial of the process of initiation.

YOUTH FORUM

People have a tendency, as they become more and more caught up in the complexity of daily affairs, to become numbed and confused by life and to regard it merely as a senseless newsreel or a jumbled dream. As a result, when they hear such exhortations as "Man know thyself," it is likely that frustration will be only heightened because they feel unable to extricate themselves from the dream they are part of; one may in fact doubt whether a man can ever know himself deeply since such knowledge, to be complete, would seem to imply separation of one's self from one's self, and surely that *is impossible. After all, how can a part of something see itself clearly, or understand its context in relation to the whole? Can that much glorified faculty of "self-awareness" really give greater depth and explicitness to our presently vague sense that "I am myself"? Is it really possible, in other words, ever to awaken from the dream?*

It becomes possible for a man to wake up from the "dream" and to gain deep insights into his own nature as soon as he becomes truly convinced that, in a sense, he is more than himself. For then the process of self-knowledge is less a matter of separating himself from himself than of joining with the most spiritual and indestructible part of his being. And, since the essence of this elusive part of man is common to all men, it should be possible to see reflections of this common Self in our own deepest intentions and in the lives of every human being whom we contact. That is to say, we may come to know ourselves quite well through constant efforts to understand and feel for others—for we are they, and all their perversity and all their glory is our own.

Of course, theory is never enough, and often, in spite of everything, we find ourselves frustrated and befuddled by life's seeming nonsequiturs. In the article "Lonely Musings," H. P. Blavatsky suggests that on waking up in the morning we ask ourselves at least three questions: What am I? Why do I work? How do I work? Such a practice is no doubt helpful, but what happens when we find we cannot answer, when we feel no deep affirmative response with-

in ourselves? The feelings of inner abandonment which we may have at such times have been very well expressed by Goethe—even speaking in a Christian context—when he makes his character, young Werther, say:

> And why should I be ashamed, in the terrible moment when my whole existence is trembling between being and not-being, when the past shines like a flash of lightning over the dark abyss of the future, and everything about me is sinking, and the world going to destruction with me—Isn't it then the voice of the creature which is being driven back into itself, fails to find a self, and irresistibly tumbles to its fall, that groans from the inner depths of its vainly aspiring powers, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?" And should I be ashamed of that saying, should I be afraid of that moment, seeing that he who rolls up the heavens like a robe did not escape it?

We are rather distrustful of absolutes these days, and enjoy making up our own theories of relativity that apply to our morality, the rigor of our mental honesty, the ardor of our search. Few people are willing to face squarely the terrifying question which Goethe presents; few, that is, are willing to take the risks entailed in waking up. And so many of us, perhaps almost all of us, do what we can to perpetuate our dreams. Collectively and individually, we create our world and then live in it, soon forgetting that the particular context which we have created is only one of a number of human possibilities existing on many levels of sophistication, each of which may be valid, and even necessary, but none of which is universal. The world of "show biz," the art world, the business world, the military world—each of these, and a thousand others, makes it almost impossible for us fully to realize that we live in *one* world; and which is not merely the summation of all these other worlds but which includes them all, and includes all the worlds of the past from Romanticism to Nazism, and yet remains as a living and unified symbol of the One Reality underlying everything.

But our ability to deceive ourselves is great, and can operate on very subtle layers of our consciousness; in fact, the subtler the more insidious. To take just one example; When Goethe's book, *The Sufferings of Young Werther,* was first published, a wave of suicides broke out in Europe, and many of the bodies found were dressed like the fictional Werther, in blue coat and yellow waistcoat, and some even had a copy of the book in their pockets. This was a shocking spectacle, not primarily because of the deaths themselves.

but because they proved that it is possible for human beings to become so wrapped up in their own romantic dreams that they will throw away their very lives rather than wake up. And truly, there is something about waking up that is even more terrifying than the thought of dying, for it implies enormous responsibility, uncompromising honesty, and an almost martyring love for mankind.

It may be possible to carry this discussion even farther if we allow ourselves to seem to change the subject for a little while, and consider a statement which C. L. Barber makes in a book on Shakespeare:

> The artist gives the ritual pattern æsthetic actuality by discovering expressions of it in the fragmentary and incomplete gestures of daily life. He fulfills these gestures by making them moments in the complete action which is the art form. The form finds meaning in life.

This statement may not be out of place here, especially if we agree with Plato's assertion that the greatest artist is he who lives a well-ordered life. But if this statement of Barber's really does apply to life, how are we to interpret it? Does it mean that we should artificially "complete the gestures," and so create an aura or dream in which to live? To come to that conclusion would be to misunderstand an essential requirement of the artist: that he be able to stand back from his work, and maintain "æsthetic distance" with regard to it in order to see the true relationship of each part to the whole. Probably, then, the implication is that we should try to expand our view to take in the whole sweep of life, seeing each context within the greater context of human possibility.

This does not mean that we should repudiate every particular approach to life as being partial. We must be partial in a sense, or our "art" could not have "style." Shakespeare in all his works expressed in some way the Elizabethan world-view, and we must fulfill within ourselves the "incomplete gestures" of these confused United States. But while working within this present context, and while savoring and helping to create its particular meaning, we must still keep our perspective, and act in such a way that our words and deeds are not *dependent* upon this particular context for their meaning. For although it is in a sense just a dream that we are fashioning, we at least can be awake; and though (as the questioner suggests) the world seems as transient and chaotic as a newsreel, we can see in what ways films can be made into works of art, thereby achieving

the beauty and eternality of art, despite obvious transience. In our own lives perhaps this means stepping back from ourselves, taking the position of the perceiver, and watching ourselves acting, even watching ourselves becoming angry or being amused or calculating or praying or despairing—perhaps even falling in love. "So that's what it's like," we would say.

Does this kind of detachment destroy spontaneity? Perhaps it could, but certainly it needn't. There is a world of difference between this detachment and that insane feeling of disconnectedness from which our whole civilization is suffering at the present time. Really it is merely stepping away a bit in order to savor more fully; and if anything would be destroyed in this process, it would be just our tendency to react blindly to one another. Such emotional tropisms, although they usually pass for communication, were perhaps better destroyed, for they have a place only in dreams, and indicate that we know deeply neither ourselves nor the person we are confronting. Far different, far gentler and yet more powerful, is that natural spontaneity of soul for soul; for it is sparked by a recognition of inner kinship, and leads us into action by the force of love.

TO BECOME AWAKE

I believe that man's growth is a process of continuous birth, of continuous awakening. We are usually half-asleep and only sufficiently awake to go about our business; but we are not awake enough to go about living, which is the only task that matters for a living being. The great leaders of the human race are those who have awakened man from his half-slumber. The great enemies of humanity are those who put it to sleep, and it does not matter whether their sleeping potion is the worship of God or that of the Golden Calf.

—ERICH FROMM

ON FIRST ACQUAINTANCE— "THE SECRET DOCTRINE"

XI

> "Conceptions of Force are resumed by our conceptions of this, that, or another mode of motion." Force is thus simply the passage of *one state of motion into another state of the same*: of electricity, into heat and light, of heat into sound or some mechanical function, and so on. On the plane of manifestation and illusionary matter it may be so; not that it is nothing more, for it is vastly more. (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 517 and fn.)

IT might be useful to think of our incarnated life as a certain quantity of energy with which the personality begins its manvantara of seventy years or so. It can do with this energy as it likes, but the use of the energy determines what we become, or at least the direction in which that lifetime bends.

Thanks to Gandhian teachings and attitudes, we in the West are gradually coming to a more useful idea of the word Brahmacharya. Purity of mind as a prerequisite to purity of body is now more clearly understood with the advance of psychology. Yet the idea that Brahmacharya may have nothing to do with asceticism, but is primarily a problem in energy-dynamics within an individual's life, is not yet too widespread. The practicality behind Gandhi's resurrection of this ancient idea may yet be more clearly understood; Gandhi's life, from one standpoint, was a study in the enlightening use of power.

The traditional pacifist position that power must be abandoned seems to have gradually given way to the idea that power can no more be abandoned than man can stop breathing, but that a more direct use of power will always overcome the less real and indirect.

It should be plain that the authoritarian use of power was unreal and self-defeating. The idea of our "outer and visible" world ruling the "inner and invisible" was a denial of the processes of nature.

From this it would be natural to conclude that Authoritarian Power is a vast conspiracy, and can best be countered, as well as exposed, by a non-conspiratory use of power, one based on individuals working within themselves. To oversimplify the idea we

might say that a rose does not change the world in the present by making another rose bloom, it alters the earth by blooming itself.

Now a rose cannot see itself bloom, nor can it be aware of the ramifying aesthetic effects. In a sense the non-authoritarian concept of power takes man to a similar position. We might say that the inwardly-directed person throws the problem of his success or failure upon the world. If we could say that the sun in shining is unconcerned with success or failure, then this principle might also apply to the non-authoritarian human: he forsakes the results of his efforts and concentrates upon the "effort" itself.

One of the problems of changing from the authoritarian viewpoint to a non-authoritarian orientation would be how to go on in the midst of a drastic failure, when all our plans, hopes, will-power, good intentions, etc., lie about in shambles. The study of something so stable as the ocean might help us learn the preseverance of continuing when formerly we might have held our heads or shrugged our shoulders and said, I can't go on! The ocean does not become distressed because its ability to roll waves onto the beach fluctuates from month to month, or even from day to day. To become accustomed to the idea that our ability may have a cyclic rise and fall could probably help us to abandon the view that takes failure as a sufficient reason to end our effort.

After all, we do not begin our highest efforts because they might succeed. We feel it as the peculiar duty *that is ours* "pushed" by the "rightness" of an action, rather than its chances of success.

While admitting that it is a long road we have before us in the effort to abandon subjection to passions and desires, it is perhaps a still longer one in learning to work for the race as if it were "inside" ourselves, as if it were mirrored always as our own "special condition." Why does our vision not stretch across the birth and death of "selfishness"—the rise and obsolescence of man as a personality? Yet one only need see a shooting star or the work of the waves on a granite cliff to realize that the vision is there waiting for the growth of our perception: Is it not a revelation held back only by immaturity of the seer? Who knows but that our minds have not yet stretched into time as they might? There may be a curve of the circle in which our time is but the tiniest arc. Like small creatures that function only at night, we may have yet to see the sun.

But despite the limitations of our present, there are gleams of our

potential—signs that the animal within, powerful though he may be, is dressed in very old cloth. Some day we may look back on the evanescent hates, loves, and fears that storm across our life, and think of them as that peculiar intoxicant of a mind trying to make-do in a world of bodies.

True, the indulgence or abstinence we experience is a mind-event, a subjective "something" that each sees firsthand only within himself, and as an "overtone" from the lives of others. Yet this overtone may be a more real indication of value than the trappings of appearance. Plotinus seemed to think so, for he said of the two:

> Wherever there is interior beauty, we may be sure that inner and outer correspond; where the interior is vile, all is brought low by that flaw in the dominants.
>
> Nothing base within can be beautiful without—at least not with an authentic beauty, for there are examples of a good exterior not sprung from a beauty dominant within; people passing as handsome but essentially base have that, a spurious and superficial beauty: if anyone tells me he has seen people really fine-looking but interiorly vile, I can only deny it; we have here simply a false notion of personal beauty.
>
> In any case the All is beautiful, and there can be no obstacle to its inner goodness: where the nature of a thing does not comport perfection from the beginning, there may be a failure in complete expression; there may even be a fall to vileness, but the All never knew a childlike immaturity.
>
> As long as we have bodies we must inhabit the dwellings prepared for us by our good sister soul (the All-Soul) in her vast and labourless creation. (Plotinus: "Against the Gnostics.")

Plotinus also felt it essential to our capacity for growth that we not disown our tie with the "Soul of the Cosmos," even though—

> Such kinship, it is true, is not for the vile; it may be asserted only of those that have become good and are no longer body but embodied soul and of a quality to inhabit the body in a mode very closely resembling the indwelling of the All-Soul in the universal frame. And this means continence, self-restraint, holding staunch against outside pleasure and against outer spectacle, allowing no hardship to disturb the mind. The All-Soul is immune from shock; there is nothing that can affect it: but we, in our passage here, must call on virtue in repelling these assaults, reduced for us from the beginning by a great conception of life, annulled by matured strength. Attaining to something of this immunity, we begin to reproduce within ourselves the Soul of the vast All. (*Ibid.*)

From this we can see that Plotinus advocates the idea of Unity as a basic framework from which the individual can feed and grow beyond himself. Such an idea might turn out to be the magic talisman by which even one fallen to a low estate can begin to travel away from the idea of being a distinct autonomous entity among many, and accept himself as One within the All. Instead of identifying ourselves with a particular body or personality, we might begin to identify with the totality of our consciousness—our inner and outer environment. If the outer is a reflection of the inner, we cannot stop at the physical body or the personality and use *that* as the complete reflection of the inner: we have to take all of the outer as a reflection of our inner condition.

Why should we limit ourselves to this particular body? We talk about the terrible conditions of the world as if somehow we and they were two different things; we talk about Hitler, or Franco, or Stalin as if these men were somehow not ourselves, as if there were some peculiar way in which we did *not* participate in their acts and their thinking. Is responsibility really thus divided? If our neighbor comes home drunk, is it only he experiencing this condition? Can we say that we too did not suffer? Are not these incredible problems an aspect of our particular condition? If not, why incarnate at this time WITH this particular set of circumstances? There is an interesting thought akin to this in the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* (Radhakrishnan edition):

> If we take the world as a whole, we have the one *nama* or all-consciousness informing the one *rupa*, the concrete universe. The different *nama-rupas* are the differentiated conditions of the one *nama*, the world consciousness. . . .
>
> He who meditates on one or another of them (aspects) he does not know for he is incomplete, with one or another of these (characteristics). The self is to be meditated upon for in it all these become one. This is the foot-trace of all this . . . (for as) We trace out lost cattle by following their footsteps, so will we find everything if we know the Self.
>
> That self is dearer than a son, is dearer than wealth, is dearer than everything else and is innermost. If one were to say to a person who speaks of anything else than the self as dear, he will lose what he holds dear, he would very likely do so. One should meditate on the Self alone . . . (and) what he holds dear, verily, will not perish.

Is this not the magic that leads away from those powerful traits of the embodied flesh which we label "passion and desire"? It might

be a characteristic of impersonal thought and act that it will cancel out or neutralize the personal. For instance, what would happen if a person who felt himself carried into the vortex of passion could *remember* long enough to say inside his mind: This body is not for personal use but for the human race. It does not belong to *a being,* but to all beings.

Is it not possible that even a thought of this sort might be lethal to personal bias? It might be as if we were a magnet and had a *way* of neutralizing our animal magnetism—our personal passions and desires—by switching the mind's attention from the particular to the ALL. By giving our life to everybody, rather than to somebody, we might become not only more useful to the planet, but also king in our own kingdom. Thus we have the paradox that in giving away the personal kingdom we gain control of it, and in holding onto it we become its slaves.

It might be in this last sense of identifying with the environment as a means of opening up new patterns of growth inside oneself that the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* says:

> If anyone, however, departs from this world without seeing (knowing) his own world, it being unknown, does not (protect him). Even if one performs a great and holy work, but without knowing this, that work of his is exhausted in the end. One should meditate only on the Self as his (true) world. The work of him who meditates on the Self alone as his world is not exhausted for, out of that very Self he creates whatsoever he desires.

Yet it would seem that mechanical meditation can neither protect nor fulfill. There must come a time with each of us when we do a thing because we can no longer keep from it. Who knows but that a time comes when the personal life loses its flavor, when desire no longer pushes toward the personal, but follows another light?

There is a passage in the conversation of Yajnavalkya and Maitreya on the Absolute Self which discusses the dangers of mechanical practices:

> Those who recite the Vedas without understanding their meaning . . . (can be compared) to lifeless pillars which bear the weight of the roof.

Then, perhaps, we can cease being a "lifeless pillar" if we connect the acts of our life to the intellect. This would mean that we never

study a thing just to be studying it, that we never postpone trying to fulfill our highest "counsel of perfection" because we are not yet ready. It may be that our Mind gains power to bore into the truth or falsity of an idea by means of the acts which we commit on behalf of that idea.

Perfectionism, say in memorizing scripture, may not be bad in itself; the "badness" may come from the idea that one goes no further. It is as if one who knew the Sermon on the Mount decided that his belief in the idea of "doing unto others as you would have them do unto you" was nullified because others were not doing it or because there was no hope of success. Yet it would seem that neither success nor the number of people who believe in an idea are prerequisites to the mind's testing it *by means of acts*.

These are outer voices. What do they have to do with our inner Voice? If we try to find out what unselfishness *means* and try to practice it, no doubt people *can and will* see it as self-centered; but this is their judgment, their vision; and applies to them, not to us. We too may later see it as selfish; but then the vision is ours, and we can make a useful change in acts patterned from the idea. Yet how can we make this change in a sincere and honest way? In other words, even if our critics are right, this "rightness" is not regenerative until we have known its truth ourselves. The outer is a sound with a thousand voices, and we will arrive at nothing but confusion, until we turn inside where there is no voice save our own idea of what is right or what is worth studying, or where on the "outside" we should listen.

Above all, though, how are we to become a Son of the All-Soul if we do not search for those lines of communication between the individual and the general, between the cell within the Body of Humanity and that Body itself?

Just as the cells derive their function from the body as a transcendent oneness, and not as if it were a collection of cells, so the individual cannot discover his dharma that he owes the planet by trying to synthesize the world of appearances outside himself.

Is it not likely that one must go to that which binds and stands behind the differentiated phantasmagoria? It may have been from

some such reason as this that ancient teaching emphasized the mind's phantasmagoria of thought as a most powerful hindrance to meditation; for when the mind throws up its coruscations of thought —infinite and multicolored, of all gradations of beauty and ugliness, of usefulness and inanity—what is it doing but creating within a situation similiar to that which occurs objectively when we seek a compass outside ourselves?

It may be that, once we have arrived in a particular body and a particular environment, we have a particular *duty* designed by the potential interplay between our operating-point of flesh and the environment body—an interplay limited by the condition of each. Yet if we do not follow *the inspiration* and parentage of the Universal Soul, we chance a dual mistake: (1) in thinking that the physical body is ourselves, and (2) in thinking that the environment is *not* ourselves; then with passions as regards our flesh, and desires with the environment, we diffuse our life, making it without worth.

In the first book of Thomas More's *Utopia,* Hythloday points out the folly of one who fails to search out altruistic inspirations from within, and follows only the conventional ideas of duty and service to others. In an introduction to Erasmus' *The Praise of Folly,* Leonard F. Dean presents a skillful discussion of the idea that compromise with one's vision leads to a more crushing sense of inanity and failure than the *apparent failure* of refusing to compromise with our "sense of rightness." In a sense we might say that Hythloday feels the Inner Light of man is an all-sufficient means to the fulfillment of our best possibilities:

> Hythloday answers [More] that to tamper with the means is to aim at another end and to miss the one desired. If he enters the play of life and conforms to the folly of the world, he will be as foolish as the rest: "while that I go about to remedy the madness of others, I should be even as mad as they." To prove his point, Hythloday cites the example of the preachers, who have lowered the ideals of Christ in order to meet the world on its own level. "Whereby I can not see what good they have done; but that man may more safely and easily be evil."

When Hythloday advocates an equal distribution of property as being a surer solution than political reform, More objects that communism would destroy initiative and lead to lawlessness, to which Hythloday replies:

> "I marvel not . . . that you be of this opinion. For you conceive in your mind either none at all, or else a very false image and similitude of this thing." When the ideal, or Utopia, is clearly conceived, the conventional objections fall aside. In Utopia, initiative and order arise from devotion to the general welfare, and they are therefore superior to the kind produced by profits and legal restrictions.

How can devotion to something so general and abstract as "the general welfare" gradually render a person more one-pointed and full of initiative than that person who works for something such as profit or status? Could it be that an altruist conforms *more surely* to reality by working for the Whole than that man who seeks to enlarge and preserve his image of himself?

THEMES OF ULTIMATE CONCERN

It is amazing, but now undeniable, that the vocabulary of symbol is to such an extent constant through the world that it must be recognized to represent a single pictorial script, through which realizations of a *tremendum* experienced through life are given statement. Apparent also is the fact that not only in higher cultures but also among many of the priests and visionaries of the folk cultures, these symbols—or, as we so often say, "gods"—are not thought to be powers in themselves but are signs through which the powers of life and its revelations are recognized and released: powers of the soul as well as of the living world. Furthermore, the signs may be arranged to make fresh poetic statements concerning the great themes of ultimate concern; and from such a pictorial poem new waves of realization ripple out through the whole range of the world heritage of myth. So that a polymorphic, cross-cultural discourse can be recognized to have been in progress from perhaps the dawn of human culture, opening realizations of the import inherent both in the symbols themselves and in the mysteries of life and thought to which they bring the mind to accord.

—JOSEPH CAMPBELL

INDIVIDUAL REQUITAL

ONLY the Individuality, which possesses the most spiritual feelings, can *survive* by uniting with the immortal principle. It is not the divine soul, the immortal Individuality, that perishes, but only the animal soul with its consciousness of a personality too gross, too terrestrial, for the former to assimilate. If we maintain that the *shell,* the reflection of the person that was, survives in the land of shades for a certain time proportionate to its constitution and then disappears, we offer nothing but the logical and philosophical. Even in the case of the most depraved, when dissociated from its divine and immortal double principle, and unable to give anything to the spiritual Ego, the material soul is annihilated without leaving anything behind of its personal individuality—is that annihilation for the *spiritual* Ego? Those whose spirit is open to the great truths, those who understand absolute justice and reject every doctrine based on favoritism or personal grace will fully understand what we mean. For the immortal soul there is nothing but justice. Conviction that life holds a definite purpose, and longing to attain this, spring from the spiritual *presence* indwelling. They are the language of the soul. The purpose of life ever remains an unknown quantity until self-knowledge is sought. We need, as monads ourselves, to take a Monadic view of life, of action, of our fellow monads.

The "cast-off existence" is for the spiritual Ego but a page torn out of the great book of life before the pages are numbered, and the SOUL suffers no more from it than a saint in ecstasy would suffer because he had lost all recollection of one wretched day among 20,000 days that he has passed on earth. On the contrary, had he retained that recollection, it would have been enough to prevent him from ever feeling happy. Only one drop of gall is enough to make the water bitter in the largest vessel. And after all, the doctrine teaches us that these cases of total annihilation of a personality are extremely rare.

Neither infants nor idiots, being irresponsible in their actions, are able to receive either reward or punishment. The difference be-

---

NOTE.—A student's collation from Theosophical sources.

tween these souls and those of people in general is that the former *incarnate immediately*. Failures of nature, they begin a new life immediately; while reincarnations in general take place after rather long periods passed in the intermediate and invisible spheres. Should we be thoroughly ostracized if we were to say that the souls of idiots and extremely young children (dying before the age of personal consciousness) are the exact parallels of those who are annihilated? Can the personalities of the infants and the idiots leave a greater trace on the *monadic* memory with which they have not been able to become united, than those of the souls of marked animal tendencies who have also, though not more than the former, failed to become assimilated therein? In both cases the final result is the same.

The sixth element of the spiritual Ego which has not had either the time or the possibility to unite with the lower principles in the case of the idiot and the infant, has had the time but not the possibility to accomplish that union in the case of the totally depraved person. It is not to say that the spiritual Ego is "dissipated" and ceases to exist. It would be absurd to say that something which is immortal in its essence can be dissipated or cease to be. The spiritual Ego is dissociated from the lower elements, and, following its divine monad—the seventh element—disappears in the case of the utterly vicious man and ceases to exist *for him,* for the personal and physical as well as for the astral man. As for the latter, once being depraved, whether it belong to an idiot or to a Newton, if it has failed to grasp, or has lost the Ariadne's thread which must lead it through the labyrinth of matter into the regions of eternal light—*it must* disappear.

Thus this *personal* astral man (or the fourth and fifth principles) whether it disappears into an immediate reincarnation, or is *annihilated,* drops from the number of the individual existences which are to the monad equivalent to days passed by an individual—a series of recollections, some fresh and eternal in our memory, others forgotten and dead, never to revive.

on the lookout

The Psychological Meaning of Reincarnation

A current volume on myths and religion, *The Wisdom of the Serpent* (Braziller, 1963), brings into another clear focus the perspectives which form the core of Herbert Fingarette's *The Self in Transformation.* The subtitle for *The Wisdom of the Serpent* is *The Myths of Death, Rebirth, and Resurrection,* written jointly by a Jungian psychiatrist, Joseph L. Henderson, and a Bollingen Foundation researcher in comparative religions, Maud Oakes. In the first chapter, the authors speak of "the archetypal pattern of initiation with its eternal theme of death and rebirth, sometimes associated with entrance into the life of a significant group, sometimes experienced in a lonely individual rite of vision." They continue:

> This rite of vision leads us to the most remote and single form of all initiation—liberation. The themes of rebirth and resurrection, so differently illustrated in the changing myths, lead to a recurrent dilemma experienced by modern people as the need to choose symbols of containment in the meaningful group, or symbols of liberation of a transcendent, individual nature. This necessarily poses an ultimate question as to whether these two kinds of symbols must remain separate or whether they may on some transpersonal level be joined and reconciled.

Symbols as Esoteric Teaching

In the chapter, "Initiation as Liberation," they say:

> In spite of the vast difference between the goals of Christian resurrection and Buddhist liberation, the process of initiatory death and rebirth provides a common denominator which is also the characteristic of any universal religious archetype. Real and symbolic become themselves relative to each other as also are life and death. Although the Christian theology of the first three centuries A.D. insisted upon the resurrection of the body as the final goal of spiritual deliverance, this tenet became somewhat softened or diluted by transfusions of ritual or image from the Greek mysteries and the Greco-Roman philosophers. So the religion of love (*agape* or compassion) had a better chance to win an equal if not superior place with the religion of judgment. In a reverse direction, Buddhism, which had always emphasized

the importance of compassion (personified in Kwan Yin or Avalokiteshvara), instead of banishing all spiritual life to some ultimate void cherished a "traditional theme . . . of the 'new body' in which the initiate is reborn. . . . and Hatha Yogis, Tantrics, and alchemists seek through their respective techniques, to obtain a 'divine body' . . . which is absolutely spiritual . . . or to change the natural body, which is raw, 'unripe,' . . . into a body that is perfect, 'ripe.' " Thus in Eastern and Western traditions of initiation we find homologous concepts which imply that there is a psychic reality or soul image which is so real that it cannot merely be dismissed as illusory. . . .

"Cycles of Nature"

In this chapter Henderson and Oakes point out the significance of much in ancient lore to which H. P. Blavatsky called attention:

In the myths of *Adonis, Attis* and *Persephone* we also find a the archetype of death and rebirth as a cycle of nature. In the seven stages of Inanna's descent, we find a reference to the phases of the moon: through its waning (death) and waxing (rebirth) it completes a cycle, which then recurs indefinitely. More direct references to the moon symbolism are found in other stories.

In the myths of *Adonis, Aaais* and *Persephone* we also find a cycle, but here it is the cycle of the agricultural year; from autumn and winter (death), to spring and summer (rebirth). In the myth of Isis (where she exhorts Thoth to heal Horus from a death wound inflicted by a serpent and bring him into a new life), we find a reference to the pattern of death and rebirth associated with a sun cycle, the setting sun representing death and the rising sun new life, i.e., rebirth.

Symbols of rebirth such as the snake, the scarab, the phoenix, and the bee are found in these myths as a part of nature. The sacred tree is perhaps the prime symbol for the cycle of death and rebirth in nature, with the yearly shedding of its leaves in autumn and its renewal in spring time. Sometimes its quality as a symbol of immortality is expressed in the evergreen tree whose leaves remain green through the winter as well as the remainder of the year. From the topmost branches of the tree there emerge symbols of rebirth and immortality, such as the mistletoe, the sacred child, moon disc or sun disc, or bird or god in the moment of his apotheosis.

The Masks of God—Continued

The third volume of *The Masks of God,* major work of Joseph Campbell (Viking, $7.95), embodies a transition from Eastern myths and symbols to those of the West. Though primarily concerned with "Occidental Mythologies," Dr. Campbell begins with

another illuminating comparison between Western religious mythology and that of the East. In so doing, he highlights one of the central themes of H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*:

> Throughout the Orient the idea prevails that the ultimate ground of being transcends thought, imaging, and definition. It cannot be qualified. Hence, to argue that God, Man, or Nature is good, just, merciful, or benign, is to fall short of the question. One could as appropriately—or inappropriately—have argued, evil, unjust, merciless, or malignant. All such anthropomorphic predictions screen or mask the actual enigma, which is absolutely beyond rational consideration; and yet, according to this view, precisely that enigma is the ultimate ground of being of each and every one of us—and of all things.
>
> The supreme aim of Oriental mythology, consequently, is not to establish as substantial any of its divinities or associated rites, but to render by means of these an experience that goes beyond: of identity with that Being of beings which is both immanent and transcendent; yet neither is nor is not. Prayers and chants, images, temples, gods, sages, definitions, and cosmologies are but ferries to a shore of experience beyond the categories of thought, to be abandoned on arrival; for, as the Indian Kena Upanishad states: "To know is not to know, not to know is to know"; and the Chinese Tao Te Ching: "Those who know are still."
>
> "O thou," states a basic Buddhist text, "who art gone, who art gone, who art gone to the yonder shore, what at the yonder shore hast disembarked: Enlightenment! Hail!"

The Psychology of the God-idea

The conception of God as a personal creator carries with it a number of important psychological consequences. Dr. Campbell continues:

> In the Western ranges of mythological thought and imagery, on the other hand, whether in Europe or in the Levant, the ground of being is normally personified as a Creator, of whom Man is the creature, and the two are not the same; so that here the function of myth and ritual cannot be to catalyze an experience of ineffable identity. Man alone, turned inward, according to this view can experience only his own creaturely soul, which may or may not be properly related to its Creator. Certain exclusively Occidental complications result from the fact that, where two such contradictory final terms as God and Man stand against each other, the individual cannot attach his allegiance wholly to both. On the one hand, as in the Book of Job, he may renounce his human judgment in the face of what he takes to be the majesty of God: "Behold, I am of small account; what shall I

answer thee?" Or, on the other hand, as in the manner of the Greeks, he may stand by his human values and judge, according to these, the character of his gods.

Consequently, Dr. Campbell furnishes a great deal of documentation for a central Theosophical analysis—which is also proposed in Erich Fromm's *Psychoanalysis and Religion*. Following is Dr. Fromm's description of the deleterious effects of the personal-God idea:

> While in humanistic religion God is the image of man's higher self, a symbol of what man potentially is or ought to become, in authoritarian religion God becomes the sole possessor of what was originally man's: of his reason and his love. The more perfect God becomes, the more imperfect becomes man. He *projects* the best he has onto God and thus impoverishes himself. Now God has all love, all wisdom, all justice—and man is deprived of these qualities, he is empty and poor. He had begun with the feeling of smallness, but he now has become completely powerless and without strength; all his powers have been projected onto God. This mechanism of projection is the very same which can be observed in interpersonal relationships of a masochistic, submissive character, where one person is awed by another and attributes his own powers and aspirations to the other person. It is the same mechanism that makes people endow the leaders of even the most inhuman systems with qualities of superwisdom and kindness.

Cosmological Symbols

The Theosophist will also be struck by Campbell's examination of the cosmic symbols so frequently discussed by H.P.B.:

> The nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars always liked to identify solar and lunar analogies in this way because they confirmed a point that was becoming clear in their time, which was that the imagery of our heritage of myth is in large part derived from the cosmological symbology of the Age of Bronze. But we now must add to this important insight the further realization that a fundamental idea of *all* the pagan religious disciplines, both of the Orient and of the Occident, during the period of which we are writing (first millennium B.C.), was that the inward turning of the mind (symbolized by the sunset) should culminate in a realization of an identity *in esse* of the individual (microcosm) and the universe (macrocosm), which, when achieved, would bring together in one order of act and realization the principles of eternity and time, sun and moon, male and female, Hermes and Aphrodite (Hermaphroditus), and the two serpents of the caduceus.

This introduces the "mystic psychology" of the Orient in a way

which invites the understanding of the Western scholar. Dr. Campbell continues:

> The image of the "Meeting of Sun and Moon" is everywhere symbolic of this instant, and the only unsolved questions in relation to its universality are: a) how far back it goes, b) where it first arose, and c) whether from the start it was read both psychologically and cosmologically.
>
> In the Indian Kundalini yoga of the first millennium A.D., the two spiritual channels on either side of the central channel of the spine, up which the serpent power is supposed to be carried through a control of the mind and breath, are called the lunar and solar channels; and their relationship to the center is pictured precisely.

The Myths of Creation

A third current volume, Charles H. Long's *Alpha: The Myths of Creation* (Braziller, 1963), indicates that significant writings such as those just mentioned are accumulating with surprising momentum. Prof. Long begins with some general observations concerning the significance of myths and symbols. He writes:

> A great deal of our modern cultural life presupposes the equation of literalness = truth. To some degree this is dictated by the scientific-technological character of our culture, but we would find it difficult to believe that anyone in our culture lives entirely in a world of literal meanings. There are human experiences on the personal and cultural levels which can only be expressed in symbolic forms. These meanings are in many cases the most profound meanings in our personal and cultural lives. They are profound because they symbolize the specificity of our human situation—they make clear to us how the world exists for us and point up the resources and tensions which are present in our situation.
>
> It is from this point of view that we must approach myth. The myth is a symbolic ordering which makes clear how the world is present for man.

Psychology and Future Religion

Researchers in depth psychology are well aware that the most profound experiences of human existence cannot be translated satisfactorily into terms of rational discourse. There is always the "beyondness" of intuitively-perceived relationships between individuals, and between the individual and his conception of cosmological structure. Prof. Long continues:

> Historical conditions thus provide the means through which expression is given to that dimension of human experience which

> is more than history. We should be careful here to avoid a dichotomy between the historical and the non-historical, the material and the spiritual. Man is a spiritual being by virtue of his historical conditioning (biological form, temporal-spatial situation), and he is a historical being by virtue of his spiritual life. The research over the past one hundred fifty years into the history of man's life on earth has made it both necessary and possible for us to make this last statement. The study of man as the development of a natural form through time cannot be denied, but this development was not a matter of the sheer working out of deterministic laws. The ability of man to grasp realities deeper than his historical conditioning is equally important in this development.

More on "Jungle Boy from Ceylon"

January 1963 Lookout (p. 72) recounted the finding and subsequent hospitalization of a child thought to have been nurtured by wolves. Although the child was called "Simba" in that article and is now called "Ramu" in a later account (Chicago *Daily News,* March 7, 1963), the report clearly deals with the same "child." The newspaper story recapitulates earlier details (hands bent inward like paws; water lapped and raw meat "gulped"; feral behavior, etc.), then continues:

> Now 18 years old, Ramu is beginning to deteriorate. He no longer can crawl. He is lifted onto a wheel chair in which he reclines all day. He eats cooked food, mostly vegetables and fruit.
>
> He is willing to wear clothes, is toilet-trained and no longer resists attempts to bathe him. He is unable to talk but gurgles at the sight of his attendants. He takes no interest in what goes on about him.

Lookout editors have the impression that accounts of such "jungle children" have come to light in Western news stories recurrently for more than a hundred years—and there is no doubt about the fact that part of Indian folklore takes such occurrences for granted. The fact that such young half-humans have never made the breakthrough to manasic consciousness is often explained Theosophically by suggesting that "the lighting up of manas" is an on-going as well as ancient event. It is reasoned that a child without association with other self-conscious minds does not emerge into self-consciousness. Even if the folklore aspect of the tradition exaggerates the facts known about "wolf children," we need not deny the psychological effects which jungle isolation may produce.

Contrasting Theories

Dr. Sharma, superintendent of the hospital where Ramu is kept, insists that Ramu was "mothered by wolves," and he is supported in this contention by a British scientist who also believes this to be a "genuine case of a child having lived among animals." But there are other views on the subject. Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, director of the Sonia Shankman Orthogenic School in Chicago, drawing on his long experience with autistic children, tends to be skeptical. "One need not go to India," says Dr. Bettelheim, "in search of a wild child. He can find them in Chicago or any large city." The following points up the similarity between autistic and "wolf" children:

> When brought to the Sonia Shankman Orthogenic School for residential treatment, autistic children display violent, animal-like behavior. They can't talk. They cry or howl, particularly like a wolf. They crawl rather than walk. On seeing an animal they respond as though they were meeting a dear, long-lost friend. One little girl fell on all fours, jumped about with head down, like a dog, made biting gestures.

Yet They've Never Been Near a Wolf!

The account continues:

> Dr. Bettelheim has enrolled children who eat only by shoving food into their mouths with pawlike motion. They prowl around at night and remain withdrawn during the day. They refuse to accept human closeness. They build themselves dens in dark corners or fashion caves out of mattresses or blankets. Their food is eaten, without utensils, in these self-created caves. . . . yet these children have never lived in the company of wolves. They have been reared by none but human beings. They are not mentally retarded. . . . They have become lost, not under primitive conditions, but in 20th century America. They have been abandoned emotionally.

The Cause?

Dr. Bettelheim observes:

> Study of so-called feral (wild) children and comparison of them with known and well-observed wild autistic children, suggests strongly that their behavior is due in large part, if not entirely, to extreme emotional isolation combined with experiences which they interpreted as threatening them with utter destruction . . . feral children seem to be produced not when wolves behave like mothers, but when mothers behave like non-humans.
>
> The conclusion tentatively forced upon us is that, while there are no feral children, there are some very rare examples of feral

mothers, of human beings who become feral to one of their children.

Dr. Bettelheim's conclusions also fall easily within the framework of Theosophical psychology.

A Magazine with Theosophic Overtones

A small magazine, *Verity,* published in London, England, seems to be a publication with especial emphasis on the Neoplatonic tradition. For example, the Autumn, 1963, issue (No. 6) includes a short sketch of Plato's life, with quotations from Synesius, Porphyry, as well as from the *Bhagavad-Gita. Verity*'s columns are apparently open to writers of all persuasions, so long as the subject-matter is broadly philosophical, rather than sectarian. The editorial statement of policy reads in part:

> In encouraging controversy in "Verity," we have something rather different in mind from the usual "airing of opinions." We believe that opinions as such can be held stubbornly and unreasonably. What is very valuable, however, is the expression of distinct viewpoints, where these arise as a result of clear and impartial thought.
>
> To think about something calmly, and then to express one's thought is not only an important exercise for us, it can also be very important to others. We may not realize this at the time. It is surprising how often a lucid thought, simply expressed, can be exactly what someone else needs. He or she may not see "eye to eye" with us at all, but what we have to offer fits in some mysterious way into the other's "picture." Many of us have had the experience of being suddenly impressed by one sentence, or even one word, in something we have heard. Somehow it "rang a bell." Equally, we never know when we are having the same effect upon others. It behoves us to be sincere when we are expressing our thought.